

I oppose loosening the rules designed to promote and protect diversity of media ownership. These rules were adopted to ensure that the public would receive a diverse range of viewpoints from the media, and not simply the opinions of a handful of media conglomerates.

1. How should the FCC measure viewpoint diversity? (The Commission suggests that it should simply be evaluated in a context of commercial competition.)
2. In what way do locally owned and controlled media outlets-TV stations and newspapers, for example-more effectively serve their communities (versus chain or network-owned properties)?
3. The FCC suggests that broadcast TV isn't as important a source of information as it once was, given the "proliferation of outlets." Do you believe this to be the case?
4. The Commission also suggests that ownership limits may no longer be necessary to promote diversity of expression in the media. Do larger media companies indeed strengthen diverse reporting and analysis?
5. How has consolidation affected the quality of local, national, and international reporting? Has media concentration diminished the ability of the news media to engage in a critical "watchdog" role over private and public interests?
6. Has the so-called explosion in outlets, as Michael Powell would have it, brought about an increase in media owned or controlled by persons of color and women?
7. Has cable television really contributed to program diversity, with real alternatives of genre and scope?
8. Does commonly owned media, as the FCC suggests, have "stronger incentives to provide diverse formats, programs, and content"?
9. Is there truly an "ever increasing number of alternative providers of delivered video programming"?
10. In determining diversity, should the commission, as it suggests, count every web site and cable channel available? Or should it be more focused on the most powerful and dominant outlets?

I would like answers to the above questions, please.
Thank you.